

---

**Sent:** 31/01/2021 12:32:44 PM  
**Subject:** Online Submission

31/01/2021

MR Daniel Watts  
214 / 408 Victoria RD  
Gladesville NSW 2111  
daniel.p.watts@live.com.au

**RE: DA2020/1517 - 45 Warriewood Road WARRIEWOOD NSW 2102**

January 31, 2021

Mrs Lauren Watts and Mr Daniel Watts  
16 Bubalo Street,  
Warriewood, NSW 2102

DA 2020/1517 - 43-45 Warriewood Rd, Warriewood.

Dear Ms Anne-Marie Young,

Further to the large number of online submissions made by existing owners and residents of Bubalo Street and Lorikeet Grove, we would like to submit our formal objection to the proposed development of DA2020/1517. We are the owners of 16 Bubalo St, Warriewood, and have a number of objections to raise and would like to see addressed in an amended set of plans. These are as follows:

#### 1. Incomplete Plans

The description of DA2020/1517 is:

"Subdivision of 3 lots into 13 lots to include 1 super lot, 11 Torrens Title residential lots and 1 lot containing the creekline corridor, civil works and the construction of two residential flat buildings containing 34 apartments including basement parking, swimming pool."

However, the plans only include 34 apartments, basement parking and swimming pool. The details for the rest of the proposal are missing. Plans for the entire proposal should be submitted in full so that council and residents who will be impacted by the development are given the opportunity to review the complete proposal in its entirety. The application for an integrated development should include the details of the integration. Something the urban design referral has also highlighted.

We have serious concerns not only about the height, size, bulk and impact of these 34, 4 bedroom apartments - but for what the developer isn't willing to disclose yet. Suggesting that the decision pending for DA2020/1517 will be used as a precedent on the remaining lots (8,9,10 and 11 and 11 Torrens Title lots) which is why we ask that council not support the plans until we all have the complete picture.

#### 2. Road Traffic

11 Torrens Title lots and two residential flat buildings containing 34 apartments will mean a minimum of 44 separate dwellings in the zone in addition to what is planned in the future for lot 8, 9, 10 and 11. The plans incorporate an overwhelmingly large basement that in itself is a monstrous overdevelopment of the site. It provides two parking spaces per apartment and 13 visitor spaces. This comes to a total of 81 car spaces just in the basement parking allocation alone. With the conservative addition of two spaces per torrens title lots, the total number of cars that can be travelling through Bubalo Street and Lorikeet Grove comes to a staggering 92 cars. This is even before the inclusion of services to the residents. This is a significant increase of traffic to a local street that was not designed for such an influx of transportation. The numbers here speak for themselves. This is a gross overdevelopment of the site, with no regard for the impact on the local community and neighbours. Bubalo Street and Lorikeet Grove are just far too narrow to accommodate for such high volume numbers of traffic and services including postal and waste removal.

If these plans are approved, congestion will occur as cars on Bubalo Street already have to pull to one side of the street to allow opposing cars passage. With a number of young families currently building or already living in this street, the safety aspect alone should be a significant reason not to burden these streets with such an increased load. Even if Pheasants Place is constructed one day in the future, the majority of traffic will still choose Bubalo Street as it is the most direct when travelling from Pittwater Road.

We believe direct access to Warriewood Road should be a part of a revised set of plans. Warriewood Road would allow a much safer, practical and efficient flow of traffic than what is proposed. We also believe that the apartments should be revised to 20, two storey apartments to reduce the impact of traffic that will affect the local community with it's basement car spaces decreased from 81 to 47.

### 3. Height Restrictions

As noted by the urban design report and the pre lodgement report, the plans should comply with the building height development standard prescribed by subclause 2F of clause 4.3 of PLEP 2014. There are breaches of the 1.84m over the 10.5m limit which need to be addressed.

But more broadly, the height and scale of this development will have significant impacts on the liveability of the existing homes that are already in place or soon to be completed, including:

The privacy of backyards, bedrooms and living areas will be impacted by a third storey, with it's residents having direct line of sight into our property and our neighbours.

Sunlight will be blocked out by early afternoon (1pm), significantly reducing the natural light and solar access to our property and our neighbours. Our home will be less energy efficient requiring more electricity for basic heating and lighting.

This is in direct conflict to a number of the stated outcomes of Pittwater 21 DCP D16.8 Spatial Separation including:

"To achieve the desired future character of the locality"

"The bulk and scale of the built form is minimised and the impact of the proposed development on the adjoining properties is minimised"

"To ensure a reasonable level of privacy, amenity and solar access within a development site and maintained to neighbouring properties".

We would request that council consider two storey residential flat building or separate dwellings as an option for the developer to explore. This design will be more in line with the existing dwellings and desired future character of the north side of Narrabeen Creek Warriewood Valley area, and blend in with the landscape as a whole. By changing the design to two storey the level of privacy, amenity and solar access to neighbouring properties will be maintained.

#### 4. Bulk & Overdevelopment of the Site

As noted by the pre lodgement report there were, and continue to be a number of design elements that are in contradiction of P21 DCP. The plans have already been categorised by council as an overdevelopment of the site which we would agree to still be the case.

The developer was advised to reduce the yield of the development and encouraged to "explore semi-detached housing, with clear and meaningful breaks between every two dwellings."

This is not represented in these plans as there are no meaningful breaks that have been incorporated in this design.

The proposed design breaches the following outcomes of P21 DCP D16.1 Character as viewed from a public space:

"Achieve the desired future character of the locality"

"To ensure new development responds to, reinforce and sensitively relates to the spacial characteristics of the existing built and natural environment"

"To enhance the existing streetscapes and promotes a scale and density that is at human scale and in line with the height of the natural environment."

The size and bulk of this proposed development directly contradicts these outcomes and will take away, rather than enhance the existing built and natural environment.

We would welcome an alternate design that further reduces the yield of the site. That incorporates meaningful breaks between dwellings, is more in line with the scale and density of existing streetscapes and height of the natural and built environment.

#### Summary

As a summary, we hope that council acknowledges the large number of formal online submissions to this DA request, as an indication of the major detrimental impacts it would have on it's neighbours and the local community. Let alone the clear deviations from the stated outcomes and controls listed in the Pittwater 21 Development Control.

We request that council does not support these plans in their current state and consider the

above amendments.

Kind regards,

Lauren and Daniel Watts

0402 690 929

0415 152 515